



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/579,463

02/08/2007

Ippeita Dan

060380

7029

23850 7590 02/03/2010  
KRATZ, QUINTOS & HANSON, LLP  
1420 K Street, N.W.  
Suite 400  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

BRUTUS, JOEL F

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3768

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/03/2010

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/579,463	<b>Applicant(s)</b> DAN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> JOEL F. BRUTUS	<b>Art Unit</b> 3768	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 November 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 6-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-2 and 6-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)         | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-2, 6-11 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Towle et al (The spatial location EEG electrodes: locating the best fitting sphere relative to cortical anatomy) in view of Jouandet US Pat: (5,038,285) or Fox et al (Pub. No.: US 2003/0050527).

Regarding claims 1, 11 and 17, Towle et al teach the international 10-20 system electrode positions and 14 fiducial landmarks are described in Cartesian coordinates. Test-retest reliability depended on the electrode position with greater measurement errors (maximum 7 mm) than midline locations. Location variability due to head shape was greatest in the temporal region, averaging 5 mm from the mean. For each subject's electrode locations a best-fitting sphere was determined (79-87 mm radius, 6% average error).

With regards to probe of claim 11 having irradiation point for irradiating radial ray or magnetic wave from head surface of a subject; It is well known in the art to use MRI probe with irradiation point to irradiate the head surface as disclosed by Towle et al

Art Unit: 3768

above. To acquire MRI images, an artisan would irradiate a region of interest with magnetic wave (emphasis added). Towle et al disclose the use of a computer to analyze a condition of the brain [see page 2]. The image data is obtained simultaneously of markers at positions on the head surface and brain surface image (emphasis added).

Towle et al teach a surface-fitting algorithm was used to transfer the electrode locations and best-fitting sphere to MR images of the brain and scalp [see summary]. Towle et al further teach Cartesian coordinates were determined using localized device [see page 2, methods].

Towle et al fail to teach minimum distance method or head/brain interior reference dotted line segment connecting method.

However, Jouandet teaches a method of deriving a plurality of tomographic slices of the three-dimensional surface; positioning reference points about a perimeter surface of each tomographic slice [see abstract]. The reference points are used herein as markers (emphasis added); creating a straight line representation of each perimeter surface with its reference points, each straight line representation having a length value proportional to the perimeter surface from which it was created [see abstract, figs 11-17]. Jouandet teaches finding the average minimum distance between positionally closest reference points on adjacent slice surface lines; and repositioning the straight line representations in accordance with the findings [see abstract].

Applicant also discloses the invention uses convex hull fitting for activating minimum distance search method [see 0020-0022, specification].

However, Fox et al teach convex hull fitting [see 0028, 0105 and 0108]. Fox et al also teach minimum distance from head surface can be created [see 0114]

Therefore, one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine Towle et al with Jouandet by using the minimum distance as taught by Jouandet for accuracy purposes or with Fox et al by using convex hull fitting for efficiency and reliability purposes.

Regarding claims 2, all other limitations are taught as set forth by the above teaching.

With regards to normalizing brain surface coordinates from a plurality of subjects onto a standard brain; Applicant discloses projection points on brain surface are determined with the international 10-20 system on head surface (for standard points) [see 0047-0048, specification].

Towle et al disclose the international 10-20 system as described above, can be used to normalize head images of subjects into a standard brain [see page 2, methods].

Regarding claims 6-7, all other limitations are taught as set forth by the above teaching.

Towle et al don't specifically mention coordinates of arbitrary points.

However, Jouandet teaches calculating coordinates of arbitrary points with respect to reference points [see figs 11-17]

Therefore, one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine Towle et al with Jouandet; for accuracy and precision purposes.

Regarding claims 8, all other limitations are taught as set forth by the above teaching.

Towle et al teach test-retest reliability depended on the electrode position with greater measurement errors [see abstract].

Regarding claims 9-10, all other limitations are taught as set forth by the above teaching.

With respect to distance distribution, Applicant disclose that distance between head surface and brain surface is obtained by arbitrary points on head surface in 3D image are projected on brain surface [see 0031]. These limitations are taught above (emphasis added) and the method is accomplished with a computer program (see page 3).

3. Claims 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Towle et al (The spatial location EEG electrodes: locating the best fitting sphere relative to cortical anatomy) in view of Jouandet US Pat: (5,038,285) or Fox et al (Pub. No.: US 2003/0050527) as applied to claims 1 and 11 above and further in view of over Yamashita et al (US Pat: 6,611,698).

Regarding claims 12-13, all other limitations are taught as set forth by the above teaching.

Towle et al don't specifically mention light measuring apparatus.

However, Yamashita et al teach a light measuring instrument that is applied to a test object, for example, the skin of the head, and light is reflected inside the test object thereby to detect the light passing through said test object and to image the cerebral interior [see column 5 lines 60-67 and column 6 lines 1-35].

The instrument is a multi channel light measuring apparatus with the number of measurement channels, namely the number of measurement positions are assumed as 12, and the number of signals to be measured (analog/digital conversion channels) are assumed as 24 [see column 5 lines 60-67 and column 6 lines 1-35].

Yamashita et al teach in figs 3-5, a plurality of light incident positions, detection position and measurement position (these positions are used as irradiation point and detection point on a surface of the subject, emphasis added) [see column 7 lines 27-29].

Therefore, one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine Towle et al with Yamashita et al by using light; in order to increase visualization.

Regarding claim 14, all other limitations are taught a set forth by the above combination.

Towle et al are silent to the near infrared.

Art Unit: 3768

However, Yamashita et al teach semiconductor lasers each emitting the light of multiple wavelengths from visible to infrared ray ranges; a light emitting diode may be used as this light source instead of a semiconductor laser [see column 5 lines 60-67 and column 6 lines 1-35].

Therefore, one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to modify the Yamashita et al reference by using near infrared region; because the living body is not harmed by application of the light.

Regarding claims 15-16, all other limitations are taught as set forth by the above teaching.

Towle et al don't specifically mention irradiation point and detection point corresponds to the central position along a straight line connecting these two points and detection point becomes maximum of distance distribution.

However, Jouandet et al teach algorithm [see figs 11-17] that can determine head surface by using irradiation point and detection of Yamashita et al and transform them to correspond to a straight line connecting these two points and to become a maximum distribution due to magnetic interaction.

Therefore, one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine Towle et al with Jouandet; for precision purposes.



***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-2, 6-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant argues that the references don't teach minimum distance method. Fox et al and Jouandet et al are relied on for the teaching of minimum distance method.

Applicant also argue that Towle et al use best fitting method not minimum distance method. Again these two newly cited references are relied for minimum distance method.

***Conclusion***

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOEL F. BRUTUS whose telephone number is (571)270-3847. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:30 AM to 5:00 PM (Off alternative Fri).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le can be reached on (571)272-0823. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. F. B./  
Examiner, Art Unit 3768

/Long V Le/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3768